IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.21874 of 2006

Dated: November 10, 2006

Between:

P.S. Niranjan, S/o. Dr. P.R. Saikumar, aged 22 years,
Occ: Student, R/o. Plot No.79, Srinagar Colony,
Hyderabad – 500 073.

… Petitioner

And

The Controller of Examinations, Osmania University,
Hyderabad – 500007, and another.

… Respondents

Order:

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in not sending the answer scripts of the petitioner of B.E (Mechanical) examination for revaluation to a third valuer as illegal and arbitrary and a direction to the respondents to send the said answer sheets to a third valuer for revaluation.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Deepak

Bhattacharjee, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

3. Petitioner, a student of Bachelor of Engineering in the second respondent college, is said to have completed the course and appeared for examinations conducted by the university during April/May 2006. When results were announced, he was declared to have failed in 'Mechanics of Materials, Machine Design, Metrology and Instrumentation, Operation Research, and Management Information System'. Dissatisfied with the marks he secured in the aforesaid subjects, he is said to have applied for revaluation of those answer scripts. Pursuant thereto, respondents are said to have revalued the petitioner's answer scripts in the aforesaid subjects and informed him that there is no change in the marks awarded to him earlier.

4. The Registrar of the first respondent-university has filed counter affidavit stating that pursuant to the request of the petitioner, his answer scripts relating to 'Mechanics of Materials, Machine Design, Metrology and Instrumentation, Operation Research, and Management Information System' were revalued by two independent valuers separately and no change was found in the result, which was originally declared. It is stated that there is no provision for further revaluation as per the existing rules.

5. It is to be seen that pursuant to the request of the petitioner, his answer scripts relating to the aforesaid five subjects were revalued by two independent valuers separately, wherein no change was found in the result which was initially declared. Merely because there is no change in the result even after revaluation by two independent valuers, petitioner cannot seek a direction to the respondents to send his answer scripts to a third valuer, more so, when there is no such

provision in the academic regulations framed by the university in this regard. In the absence of any such regulation, no direction as sought for can be given.

6. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

November 10, 2006
MRR